

State—92 percent of children under 18—are eligible for this.

These are all numbers and these are all statistics, but here is what it means. I did a series of roundtables in Cleveland and Columbus and Dayton and Cincinnati and Toledo and Youngstown and Fremont and Bryan and Defiance, OH. Here is what I heard. One woman said: You know, my son, for the first time in his life, I can send him for a week at summer camp because of this child tax credit.

A father said: I can buy the equipment for my daughter to play fastpitch softball now.

Another said: I am so anxious—I heard this many times—I am so anxious at the end of every month during the last week. How am I going to cobble together the money to pay my rent? And often I have to choose between buying enough food and paying my rent.

Others said: Now I can work more hours because I can afford daycare for my children.

A few said things like: You know, now, per child—my babies are 3 and 4 years old—I can put \$100 a month aside for each of them so they can go to Loraine Community College or Sinclair or Northwest State Community College or Ohio State University or Denison. They can get a start on saving money. Why wouldn't we want to do that?

We talk about infrastructure around here. Infrastructure is building a foundation so families can launch their children to a better life. And providing families \$250 or \$300 a month—month after month after month—gives those families, give those kids an opportunity they never would have had. Why wouldn't we think this is the best day this Congress has had in 25 years when we do that? It is pretty simple.

You know what I really like about this—and I know the Presiding Officer appreciates that in Maine; Senator KING in Maine, Senator GRASSLEY in Iowa—we don't make the decisions about what these parents should do. We provide them the dollars. They spend it best, whether it is a family in Dubuque or a family in Portland or whether it is a family in Mansfield or Cleveland. I don't know what is best for them. We provide them the dollars. They make the decision of what is best for their child—summer camp, diapers, softball games, saving for college, just having enough to eat, occasionally getting to go out to a diner down the street in Lima, OH. All those kinds of decisions, let the parents make.

We are giving them that. If we care about family values, if we care about our families, give them a little more help. It will make a huge difference in their lives.

That is why it is so important. It starts today, then next month, and the month after, for a year.

We need to renew this. We need to make sure it is permanent. If we do that, it is going to launch a whole generation of kids and give them more op-

portunity. What is not to love about that?

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, why is there such an increase in violent crimes in American cities?

In New York City, the murder rate is up 37 percent from 2 years ago; in Atlanta, 53 percent from 2019. In Portland, OR, murders have increased over 500 percent.

So everybody is asking: What is going on?

Well, if you were to ask President Biden, he would say the usual rhetoric about how we need more gun control. The White House recently put out a so-called strategy to reduce crimes.

What is the first thing that the President wants to do about this issue? Go after rogue gun dealers. Well, we all know gun dealers must follow the law, like doing background checks. We all agree on that. But I don't think anyone truly believes that legal gun dealers are responsible for the sudden spike in violent crime, including our own Department of Justice.

Referring to a Department of Justice 2019 report, inmates who committed a gun crime most likely got their weapons from the black market—no background checks there. In fact, according to this report, only about 1 in 50 Federal inmates got a gun from a legal firearms dealer.

Speaking of which, if Democrats really want to protect Americans from illegal gun sales, they should support my bill, the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act, which would actually do that.

But getting back to the recent crime wave, the real problem is what everyone knows but many of my friends on the left dare not say. The real problem is that for the past 14 months, police officers across the country have been vilified for doing their job, which has led to many of those same police leaving their job. In addition, liberal communities—and everybody knows most of our big cities of America are run by Democratic mayors—reduced the police forces and even reduced prosecutions. The result is that in San Francisco, for example, as you see on television, shoplifting appears to be a way of life.

Some police have pulled back from making sure that we are all safe because in too many cities, elected officials don't have their backs.

Last year, Attorney General Barr enacted Operation Legend, which paired Federal law enforcement officers up with local police in nine cities where crimes were soaring. This led to the arrest of 6,000 violent criminals by the end of last year, including hundreds of murderers.

Now, does this White House have the will to support law enforcement so the police can make our streets safer? Does the President have their backs?

Recently, the President's spokesperson said it was the Republicans who wanted to defund the police, not the Democrats. And that is just plain untrue and everybody knows it. What they were trying to say is that Republicans didn't support the Democrats' irresponsible spending bill back in March.

That is not defunding the police. That is just being fiscally responsible. It is not Republicans who say things like: "No more policing, incarceration, or militarization. It can't be reformed," or words like "defunding the police means defunding the police."

Let me give you another example. The push to take resources away from law enforcement is alive and well over in the House. A couple of weeks ago, the Senate passed three bills that would support police. The first one is the Protecting America's First Responders Act. That bill makes sure seriously injured first responders or their widows and children get the benefits that they are entitled to.

The second bill, the COPS Counseling Act, creates a zone of privacy for police officers so that they can have counseling sessions for traumatic experiences and protect their privacy.

A third bill, the Jaime Zapata and Victor Avila Federal Officers Protection Act, makes it clear that killing a law enforcement officer overseas is a crime in the United States.

The Senate passed these bills because when it comes to law enforcement, we have their backs.

But right now, Democratic leadership in the House is preventing a vote on these bills. Why? I don't know. They are bipartisan bills that should easily pass with resounding support. If you are with me on funding the police, I know you will support these bills. If the President wants to reduce crime, he should tell our police: Go out there. Patrol our streets. We have your back.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

#### THE ECONOMY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, Members of the Senate were all home last week for 2 weeks during their State work period. It was a good time to get back—to get back to reality, as I call it, because we all know here in Washington, people aren't always operating in reality. If we were, we wouldn't be seeing some of the policies that are coming out as we speak.

These State work periods are a great time to hear directly from the people we represent, and that is who we work for—what they care about and how they are affected by what is happening here in our Nation's Capital.

This is what folks back in Alabama were talking about. They were talking about small businesses that can't find people to work because the government is paying more in unemployment benefits than folks make on the job. And that is understandable. We have to understand that, and we have to understand the problem and how we rectify